

DETROIT BLDG.
DETROIT

EO 9 1948

December 1948

CHILD WELFARE

JOURNAL OF

THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

VOLUME XXVIII • NUMBER 9

price 35 cents

CHILD WELFARE

JOURNAL OF THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, Inc.

Published Monthly except August and September, by the Child Welfare League of America

• HENRIETTA L. GORDON, Editor

ANNUAL SUBSCRIPTION \$3.00

SINGLE COPIES 35 CENTS

Child Welfare is a Forum for discussion in print of child welfare problems and the programs and skills needed to solve them. Endorsement does not necessarily go with the printing of opinions expressed over a signature.

CHECKS PAYABLE TO Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

130 East 22nd Street, New York 10, N.Y.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PUBLICATIONS

E. MARGUERITE GANE, *Chairman*

Executive Secretary, Children's Aid and S.P.C.C., Buffalo, N. Y.

MARGARET BARBEE

Executive Director

Sheltering Arms Children's Service, New York, N. Y.

SALLIE E. BRIGHT

Executive Director

National Publicity Council for Health and Welfare, New York, N. Y.

ADELAIDE KAISER

General Case Work Supervisor

Division of Child Placing, Monroe County Department of Public Welfare, Rochester, N. Y.

FREDERICA NEUMANN

Director of Case Work Services

Jewish Board of Guardians, New York, N. Y.

MARY LOIS PYLES

Faculty

Nashville School of Social Work, Nashville, Tenn.

FRED A. SCHUMACHER

Executive Director

St. Christopher's School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.

RUTH WEISENBARGER

Executive Secretary

Children's Bureau of Delaware, Wilmington, Del.

MRS. ROGER M. WOOLLEY

Board Member

St. Christopher's School, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Changing Use of Children's Institutions	3
Residence Clubs for Adolescent Girls	7
Frank Pentlorge	
The Man	10
The League's Advocate	10
Reader's Forum Adoption of Negro Children	11
The Essential Functions of a Board of Directors	12
The Board Member Speaks on the Charity Ball Passes	15
Planning for Child Welfare	16
A City Department of Health Sets Up a Day Care Unit	17
To Make Wills Most Effective	18
Pamphlet Notes	19
Recent Additions to League's Library	19

CHANGING USE OF CHILDREN'S INSTITUTIONS

Jack R. Parsons

Assistant Professor of Sociology and
Social Work, University of Oregon

Everyone with responsibility for the care of children away from their own homes, whether member of the Board of Trustees or of the staff will be deeply interested in this appreciation of what we can learn from the Hampstead Nurseries that will advance the quality of services to children.

THE Hampstead Nurseries have been closed now for a period of three years. Perhaps it is a little early to try to see the work done there in its proper perspective—perhaps that will never be done. It is not too early, however, to look back to see if anything presented at these nurseries during its existence is of value in the institutional field of today. Was it just an experiment for the war years, or did its directors enunciate principles and practice techniques which are of value to us in other phases of child care, particularly for the child away from his own home?

The two books* based on the Hampstead Nursery experience have been called the outstanding contributions to the field of child welfare to come out of the war. Undoubtedly it will take time for this material to reach all individuals and groups who are responsible for care of children away from their homes, but eventually its influence is certain to be felt widely.

Observations at the Hampstead Nurseries

I had the privilege of visiting two of the Hampstead Nurseries during the winter of 1944. I was stationed several hours' ride from London, and learning of a week end leave in advance (a somewhat unusual occurrence in the Army) I wrote to Anna Freud, asking if I might visit. She graciously granted my request and suggested I come at seven in the morning, since that was the best time to observe all the children, as well as the most easily available time for her.

With the help of a British friend I located the Nursery at the early hour suggested, and was welcomed by Miss Burlingham, Miss Freud's colleague, who was in charge of the Nursery. She told us that the children had just started to come down for breakfast, and that we would have a chance to talk together later. She ushered us into a side room filled with small chairs and tables, and introduced us to Miss Freud, a small, shy, plainly dressed woman who

was warm in her greeting and seemingly pleased that her work was attracting some attention. She asked if we would care to sit beside her in an inconspicuous corner where we could observe the children without too much distraction. Miss Freud explained some background regarding the children and the organization of the Nurseries which was unknown to me.

Family Setting

As we talked, the children could be seen descending the stairs, sometimes alone, sometimes in groups of two or three, all busy chattering as small children do. Most of them were between two and five years of age.

One noticed a free and happy air about the place, for the children came down the stairs much like in a family—certainly without marching down, or without the air of being herded. Miss Burlingham, who meanwhile had seated herself on another side of the room, began to serve the children, who took their bowls and went to various tables throughout the room. Miss Freud explained that the children sat wherever they pleased and with whomever they desired; or, if they liked, they could sit alone. In pointing out one child who had done this, Miss Freud remarked that few of us feel sociable at breakfast. I was to see more of this individualistic philosophy practiced during my visit, and to compare it many times with the regimented practices which characterize so many of our own institutions.

Whenever the children finished their breakfast they left the room to go to an adjoining playroom—others, wanting more breakfast, came back to Miss Burlingham. In the intervals Miss Burlingham had an opportunity to tell Miss Freud her observations as well as those of other members of the staff—particularly pointed facts regarding the children's behavior and preoccupations during the previous day. Miss Freud took note of these, commenting on some and merely taking down others. She and Miss Burlingham did all this in a businesslike way, out of the hearing of the children, and wasting little time in the doing.

When we had finished our questions to Miss Freud, Miss Burlingham was free for a short while before the children were to go to the school building, and offered to show us over the residence. With her we saw the bomb-proof basement used for sleeping purposes, the facilities for bathing, playing and all the rest.

* Burlingham, Dorothy, and Freud, Anna, *Young Children in War Time* (1942) and *Infants Without Families* (1943), George Allen and Unwin Ltd.

Proportion of Adults

During our inspection we were impressed by the considerable numbers of adults we saw throughout the building and questioned our guide. Miss Burlingham explained that many of the adults were parents or relatives of the children, while others belonged to the regular staff or were in training. She told us that the ratio of adults to children was approximately one to two—a ratio necessary, she and Miss Freud believed, because of the very young ages of their charges. Furthermore, she said, the Nursery was used as a training center for nurses or aides.

The Children's Parents

Miss Burlingham accounted for the parents or relatives by saying that they came at all hours, whenever they were able to. They are encouraged in this and they fulfill several functions—bathing the children, reading or playing with them, and taking them out when possible, besides satisfying the most important nonphysical functions and emotional needs of the children.

The Nursery's concern, Miss Burlingham continued, was with maintaining or strengthening family ties where any existed. If a mother or older sister could come only in the morning on her way to or from work (many night and swing shifts were of course necessary during the war years), the directors felt that the institution must adjust itself to the situation if they were to practice their philosophy.

I have thought about this point many times since, and have tried to relate it to my own experiences and thinking. How often have we taken upon ourselves the functions of the parent, when that is not called for in the individual instance? Even though the old practice of "admission by surrender" has passed into oblivion for the most part, the idea persists in institutions that children entrusted to us are "our" charges, and that parents are not to interfere with our management.

School Life

After the tour of the building, Miss Burlingham asked if we would be interested in seeing the Nursery School at Wedderburn Road. We watched one small group of four or five children put on their wraps, and then accompanied them with Miss Burlingham. As we proceeded, she remarked that the Nursery limits groups to small numbers during walks, in order to prevent the "straggling along" so often seen in American school groups, and in order that the staff can give the children the attention they require. She explained, too, that the school is located in a

separate building several blocks removed from the residence to further the feeling of school's being a separate place, which produces a lifelike situation—the need for which must ever be kept in mind in institutions.

The school was equipped with much the same material one finds in our better nursery schools. The practice of allowing considerable self-directed or group-directed play was followed. Much of the children's play that particular morning reflected their own experiences. We watched them relive air raid alarms, crouched under tables and giving their version of sirens. Opportunity was provided also for play with water—children's mops and buckets, dish-washing equipment for their toy dishes, and the like. Much imitation and fantasy play, so well described in the later book, *Infants Without Families*, occupied their time, as did outdoor play, since the day was a pleasant, warm one. Later, we accompanied the children back to the Nursery for lunch, talked with other members of the staff and then took our departure while the children were having their naps.

The Nursery's Contributions to Child Care

In this country our residential nurseries are few in number, and it is highly questionable whether we now need many institutions for children below the adolescent stage. I am sure, however, that some of the principles of the Hampstead Nursery have value for the entire institutional field. Some, especially the second enunciated below, are indivisible from the larger frame of reference of society. Just as children's services as a whole cannot exist in a vacuum, so also must the Nursery's principles be seen in their true relationship.

These principles are not listed in any order of importance in the present paper, nor can the following be considered an exhaustive list of them. Details, especially of the theory and explanation of psychological mechanisms, are well described in the two books* referred to earlier, and will not be repeated here.

The Need of Skilled Institutional Staff

In the first place, have we made use of trained persons for the necessary work of our institutions? Are we getting the best people, or must institutions take the candidates who are "left over" from other fields? At the Hampstead Nursery we had an unusual opportunity to see in action the best staff obtainable; and while a final evaluation may never be made as to the effect of their efforts on the lives of the children in their charge, I have little doubt that only in such a setting, and with such understanding help, could such results as were seen have been accomplished. Here were professional persons who knew, and had the courage to practice, a philosophy of child care

* *Ibid.*

that was by no means new but was certainly untried in the majority of institutions. Here were workers who could observe and know the meaning of what they observed; who had understanding of the basic needs of children, and the technique for effectively meeting these needs.

How many of us, for example, try to "direct" children's thoughts away from what we regard as harmful experiences, when we know, or should know, that these experiences cannot be submerged without eventual damage, that the child's solution must come from reliving, talking out, or acting out these experiences?

How many of us (and I am as guilty as the rest) have failed to realize the value children attach to scraps which tie them to the known past, and to the experiences they have gone through, even though we may look upon these experiences with horror or disgust?

I can still picture Tommy when he was first brought to an American institution: an extremely neglected little lad of four or five who had packed his own belongings when the worker found him. In his bag, a gunny sack, were some rags and a filthy pillow. They were Tommy's connecting links with what he had known, and I, in my sanitation-minded manner, proceeded to burn these precious belongings. Fortunately his clothes remained, and some tie with the past was saved; but I lacked the understanding by which Tommy might have been helped over this period.

The location of institutions, the necessity for varying work schedules, and the status of most institutions (to name three factors) have all contributed to the problem of skilled personnel's not being available for institutional work.

The Use of Personnel

Second, are we really using all the possible sources of personnel in the management of our institutions? I have heard many times, and have complained myself, of lack of staff, difficulties in recruiting staff, and all the rest. On reflection, however, I am sure we are not using and have never used the resources that oftentimes lie within our grasp. I have said earlier that institutional practices are closely allied with larger social values, but even so, practices need not remain, or be thought of as remaining, fixed or unchanging.

As to the importance of staffs for institutions, I was impressed with England's wartime policy of the exemption from military or labor service of educational and institutional personnel. Although the country was greatly pressed for manpower, even resorting to a labor draft unlike the United States, here was a group considered by the government so vitally necessary as to be exempt. Compare this policy with our own country's lack of recognition of the value of

institutional work, with the result that institutional personnel were given something in the neighborhood of an AA-10 rating.

Even in peacetime, however, I believe that the recognition of the following point would enable us to utilize a resource hitherto overlooked or ignored. Utilizing volunteers and persons in training, of course, increases the load of work. It can and will, however, have lasting effects and advantages in the long run. At training centers our standards must be high or be of little value, but with the growing emphasis on graduate training and the increasing numbers of schools and enrollees in such schools, the goal of obtaining students and volunteers is worthy of our best efforts. Full utilization of volunteers for institutional work has not yet begun.

Strengthening Family Ties

Third, the obligation to truly maintain and strengthen family ties is one we can no longer ignore. Even in institutions which care for children for relatively long periods of time, I believe there is much that can be done in this area. Visiting an institution last fall, I overheard a telephone conversation that brought the forgetting of family ties forcibly to mind. The superintendent was interrupted in his talk to our group with a request that he take a long-distance telephone call. The father of a boy who had been in the institution nearly four years was arranging to come for his son on Friday, and was going to make a rather long trip to get him. The father had remarried, and had made all arrangements.

"Couldn't you come next week?" asked the superintendent. "We are playing a basketball game on Saturday and the boy is on our team."

I do not believe the superintendent thought through what he had said, nor do I believe he meant to be unkind. I do believe he was expressing a common fault that can be found in many places. We often think more of the immediate situation in the institution, and not of the long-term consequences to the child and the family.

Are most of our visiting days and hours for the convenience of the staff and of the institutional program, or for the convenience of parents? Must we be rigid in our visiting hours and days? Have we anything to hide, to make us strive for strict, immaculate cleanliness during visiting hours so that people may see us in our Sunday best; or is rigidity in visiting schedules a sign of our own fears? That there are instances where parents and relatives may not visit I am well aware. Court orders, cases of serious neglect and cases of adults' using children for

their own nefarious ends are examples. Yet are these cases not a relatively small number? Are we following a philosophy of respecting individual differences when we allow these few to influence our attitudes and behavior toward the rest? Have we created stereotypes because of the unpleasant situations a few parents have created?

I am aware, too, of the well-meant but often harmful actions of some parents who, on visiting, bring great armloads of sweets and contraband articles. Yet it has been my experience that frequent visits tend to eliminate this tendency. If not, the problem can be handled through discussions with parents. Such behavior has meaning to the parents, for they seek, in many instances, to give concrete assurance to themselves and to others that they love their children, by implying, "See what great things I bring you." The problem for the institution, as I say, can be handled in a far more constructive way than by forbidding visits.

I do not wish to stress the negative aspects of relationships with parents. Much of our thinking, our attitudes, and our beliefs are pointed in the direction of making parents feel they are welcome, and that they have a place in the lives of their children and so a place in the institution. Pleasant and private visiting space can aid this integrating process, as can freedom for parents to wander about the grounds. The reception given parents by the staff is important, since it sets the stage. Meals to visitors at institutions are a plaguing question, and all the more so when institutions are located a considerable distance from the place of residence of the parents. Yet what a great deal this simple act can do to strengthen family ties, if that be our goal—providing meals at a nominal cost and with some degree of privacy!

The majority of my illustrations have dealt with material or physical arrangements regarding parents' visits, and that perhaps is unfortunate. Families do not decide to reunite merely because we have made convenient physical arrangements for them to be together in our institutions. Family ties can be strengthened fundamentally, however, when we make it known that we realize that the child still belongs to his parents, even though he is in the institution; that the parents can make a contribution to the welfare of the child by their presence and their interest; that the staff stand ready to help in their understanding of the child, or in any other way if a new family basis is needed; that the institution and its services are merely supplementing the home for the welfare of the child. These attitudes can strengthen family ties, and our physical arrangements can help in carrying them into practice. To do so effectively requires that we examine our own behavior toward parents first,

making sure that we understand ourselves and our attitudes.

Treating Children as Individuals

Fourth, individualizing children in institutions seems to be related closely to all other questions, and thus to demand considerable attention. It seems especially related to the ratio of staff to children—a basic problem demanding our worthiest efforts. We have long thought of institutional care as "cheap" care—or, at least, as less expensive than foster home care. I believe this idea has been dissipated to a great extent since our institutions have taken on specialized functions, and since we have learned more of children's needs and of what they are trying to tell us. But the idea remains, however, in the minds of some laymen.

It does no good for an institution to speak of individualizing a child's needs unless the staff have the time and the patience and the knowledge to try to meet these needs. Figure out, if you will, the relative amount of time spent by various staff members directly with the children, and compare it with the staff time spent in maintenance, physical plant care, production or administration. To illustrate the difference in emphasis, I have always been able to find in annual reports the amount of produce raised in various state training schools. I can find in the reports very little information relating to the boys themselves, except as to the crimes they committed to bring them to the training school. Admittedly, annual reports are very poor places in which to look for indications of individualization; yet I believe they are somewhat symptomatic. We cannot, and would not want to in all cases, if we could, replace or substitute a family setting for the older boy in the institution; many older boys are unable to accept a family atmosphere, and make a better adjustment in the impersonal setting of group care. Where a family setting is desirable, however, it is sheer quackery to speak of "individualizing" with thirty or forty children to a cottage. Mere physical ratios do not necessarily accomplish the result of individual attention, but Mr. Hopkirk has suggested as a step that one housemother have no more than ten or twelve children; and that with preschool children, the group never exceed twelve (and the worker have one or more assistants).^{*} I myself would question having more than three or four children in a preschool group, or more than six in a school age group, if we are to translate our philosophy of individualization into practice successfully.

^{*} Hopkirk, Howard W., *Institutions Serving Children*, Russell Sage Foundation, 1944.

Reporting Results

Finally, I believe we can learn from the Hampstead experience something regarding research. In London, during the short period of the Nursery's existence, and under the pressure of war with all it meant, research of lasting value was produced, research which has added to the world's knowledge, of value for itself as well as for utilitarian purposes. The Nursery's research was of a high order, and it has been presented in a fearless and honest way.

For example, the directors found some disadvantages to their children in residential nursery life.

They presented these disadvantages along with their other findings. Here was no cover-up, no attempt at self-advertising, no one-sided picture of painted glory. "Here is what we found—learn from it what you may, for it belongs to all."

Such a contribution to knowledge means more than the extra hours that writing and seeking information entail—it means going outside our ethnocentric shell and presenting our faults and our limitations for the world to see, as well as our strengths and our values. Is this too much to expect from the rest of us in reporting our experiences?

RESIDENCE CLUBS FOR ADOLESCENT GIRLS*

Winifred Walsh

Executive Secretary, The Mary Bartelme Club,
Chicago, Illinois

Is foster care of adolescents a matter of concern to you? Here is the story of one agency's program of group care for girls between the ages of 13 and 18 that can give you a basis for examining your own program status.

THE Mary Bartelme Club, named for the Cook County Juvenile Court Judge, provides three small-unit residence clubs for emotionally disturbed adolescent girls. At present approximately 30 girls between the ages of 13 and 18 are in residence, 10 girls living in each of the three residences. The girls are all dependent, and were referred by other social agencies. For a variety of reasons they cannot live at home, and foster homes and other possible types of care have been considered less suitable than these small group units. For the most part these girls have not only the problems that accompany dependence, but in addition show either acting out or withdrawn neurotic behavior. Their temper tantrums, trancies and like actions have brought them into difficulty with schools, foster parents and others, or their tendencies to withdraw, to resort to periods of sleep, or the existence of psycho-somatic complaints have interfered with their adjustment in previous placement. At present, we are equipped to care only for the girl who, although disturbed, is sufficiently integrated and has sufficient control over herself to permit of quite regular attendance at school or work. Our open setting and the amount of supervision and trained staff available do not permit us to serve the girl who is psychotic or has a well-established pattern of delinquency. We therefore accept such girls as:

Ellen, a fairly conforming, withdrawn child. She did not participate in group activities, frequently remained by herself and read a great deal, was vague

and listless. The other girls did not accept her. She pretended not to hear their derogatory comments, or when she admitted hearing them said she didn't care, because the other girls were stupid, or babyish.

A 16-year-old refugee girl who reacted aggressively in foster home placements. She was constantly impudent and provocative. She refused to assume responsibility for care of herself or her room and refused to co-operate with family routine in such things as appearing on time for meals. She also did some petty stealing.

A 14-year-old released from a state hospital where she had been placed because of a severe depression.

A 16-year-old girl who had been sexually delinquent and who reacted seductively to foster fathers. It appeared her sexual activity had resulted from her feeling of rejection and her need for affection and protection.

Essentials in Small-Group Living

Each of our three clubs is located in a good neighborhood and looks like the other residences in the block. The girls participate in outside activities. They attend the public school and they go to the neighborhood church of the denomination of their own and their families' choice. Our number is small and we are therefore not tempted to create our own community. It is also small enough to be accepted within the schools, etc., without standing out as a "sore thumb."

The small residence gives the opportunity for some of the homelike atmosphere of a family without

* From a report presented at the National Conference of Social Work at Atlantic City, New Jersey, April 22, 1948.

making the same or as strong emotional demands, and for such girls as those in our care this is frequently desirable. A girl who wishes, or needs, for a time to keep somewhat to herself may do so, and is able to establish relationships with the other girls or adults at her own pace. There are a number of individuals from whom the girl may choose a "friend" or friends. She may from time to time be angry with, or feel hurt by, one person, but there is someone, maybe the housemother or her social worker, who is "different" and can help her to live through this hard period without having to act in such a way as to be harmful to herself or others.

The club has a few basic rules dealing with such things as hours and regular attendance at school or work. The girls know these requirements are made for all and enforcement therefore tends not to be a personal matter. It seems to be easier for many of these adolescent girls to conform if others are doing so. It also helps if at least part of the pressure toward conformity comes from their own group. We have found that when the majority of the girls feel the club is "theirs," they are inclined to expect each other to do the things which make their living together comfortable. Group living also permits offering varying activities. Those girls who are not ready to participate in community functions can choose from those available at the club, or opportunities can be stimulated to permit each to build on her skills or talents.

The Program

Two of the clubs are for high school girls and the third houses only 16- and 17-year-olds who have quit school and are attempting to maintain employment. We allow for individualization, but have separated the school and work groups because with our present facilities it seems that the best range within which to individualize successfully comes when the chief activity is participated in by all. Within the major framework of the basic activity, which is either attendance at school or work, we try to make every opportunity for individual differences and development. For example, because our groups are small, routine may be changed to meet the needs of the majority. At the working girls' club, for instance, job hours vary, breakfast can be an individual matter, and dinner can be set for the most convenient hour.

At the school clubs, the girls making average grades or better are free to plan outside activities that get them home by ten o'clock, which is bedtime. Some sing in the church choir and practice one night a week. Some take lessons at the Art Institute and get home for a late dinner. One girl has outstanding dramatic ability and two evenings a week attends a

dramatic workshop. Another has an after-school and early evening job. Each girl at the club has at least average intelligence and each knows she can have evening privileges if she does average work. Those who do below average school work participate in a study hour. Others who are home are expected to study or do something quietly during this time.

In all the clubs two girls generally share a bedroom. They may have radios, provided they are used with respect for the rights of others. They may add their own pictures and other personal articles. They spend time in their rooms alone or with their roommates or others. Girl and boy friends can call after school and on week ends, and are invited to participate in our activities. Families are expected to visit these same times, but again exceptions are made. For example, one mother does domestic work and has Tuesdays off. She always visits that day. She is foreign, has been hospitalized for a mental illness and has few friends or acquaintances. She frequently stays for dinner. Her acceptance by the girls and housemothers has helped to give her, as well as her daughter, much needed security. Visits home and with friends can be made in the girls' free time, that is, during the day, or early evening, on week ends. Overnight visits are planned with the girls' social workers, housemother, and own family, and are approved by me.

To carry out such a program, we have the following personnel: two housemothers in each club and a relief housemother, one full-time and one part-time social worker, an activities leader, a tutor, a consulting psychiatrist, two physicians, and the Executive Secretary. In addition, we have psychological services.

Casework Service

The girls' first and continuing contact is with the social worker. We carry full casework responsibility for about sixteen of the girls. The casework responsibility for the remaining number is carried by the agency that referred them. For an agency to continue working with a girl, their worker must be able to see her as frequently as seems indicated, there must be a psychiatrist on their staff who is available for consultation, and it must appear there are values for the girls to continue with the established relationship. A frequent consideration is that this permits the referring agency to use our small group residence as one step in the treatment plan.

Following receipt of a detailed referral, our social worker has an interview or interviews with the girl and her family, if we are to carry casework responsibility. If another agency is to continue the casework,

the girl and her worker are interviewed by the Executive Secretary. If it appears this is a girl we can work with, she is taken to visit the club where she will be placed. She meets the housemother and usually some of the resident girls. She is told of our rules and regulations. We help her understand our way of operating, so that if she wishes to come she can willingly try to live within the rules and regulations. In certain instances, such as some court referrals, a girl may feel that coming to the club is the less undesirable opportunity available to her and may make her choice on that basis. However, she is not accepted without an opportunity to give thought to the plan and decision.

After the girl is placed in the club, the social worker introduces her to school or helps her find a job. The housemother has been familiarized with the girl's background, and the possible difficulties that might be expected. How they might be handled have been talked over with her.

The social worker continues to see the girl at least weekly. In periods of stress a girl may be seen two, three or more times a week. She helps the girl make the adjustment to the club—to the various people—and helps others understand the girl. She is her ally during periods of difficulty and helps her understand her behavior. She co-ordinates the girl's planning with the housemother and her own family. When it is time for the girl to leave the club, the worker assists in making these plans, too. Discharge is on an individual basis. School girls may remain as long as they are in school, but leave sooner when it appears another plan will better meet their needs. Working girls leave when they are eighteen or as soon thereafter as satisfactory plans are worked out. The social worker continues to see a girl after discharge from the residence unit if the girl needs and is able to accept this help. Occasionally, when long-time planning appears to be indicated, such as financial, a girl is referred to another agency for further help.

Psychiatric Services

Weekly psychiatric consultation is available to our workers. Our consulting psychiatrist has worked with the program during the past five years, knows the physical setup, the Board, the staff and the girls. She has visited each club at least once a year. The girl discussed at staff is therefore someone she has met and been able to form an impression of, in addition to having the information supplied by the worker. The psychiatrist has helped in the evolving of program, of intake and discharge policies. The activities leader and the chairman of the Case Committee, who is a trained social worker, usually attend the staff.

The housemothers attend, but there a selection is made, depending on the housemother's readiness to participate in staff deliberations to the advantage of the girl.

Psychological testing has been available for the past year through a co-operative project with the University of Chicago, Department of Psychology. Both group and individual testing have been done. Plans for testing and the results are discussed by the social worker and psychologist, and a joint decision is made relative to the interpretation to be given the girl.

Other Services

In our program the housemother in charge of the individual unit shares in the day-to-day living and thereby carries a large part in the treatment program. She, with agency support, is the immediate authority—the person who helps train the girl to live with others. She must be accepting and understanding and at the same time remain firm and consistent. Our housemothers are untrained. They have weekly conferences with the Executive Secretary. The frustrations of the job are discussed, and an attempt is made to give them support and reassurance, to establish basic concepts for the care of adolescent girls and understanding of their problems. We have the attitude that it is all right to have resentment over a particular incident, but this does not mean rejection of the girl. We believe it is vital to a program such as ours to have the best possible houseparents.

A trained group worker assists in the activity program in all three clubs. She helps with study hour, crafts, games, parties, preparing and serving of meals, etc. Our activities program is not an entity. It is intended to stimulate plans by the individual girl.

The physical health of the girls is under the supervision of a private physician retained by the club. Each girl is given a routine physical examination upon admittance, a routine checkup once a year, and additional care as indicated. Laboratory tests and hospital care are provided through agreement with clinics and hospitals. Each girl is accompanied on her visits to a doctor or clinic, and she is prepared in advance for whatever examination is planned.

As Executive Secretary, my relationship to the girls comes primarily through co-ordinating the work of others. At present, I work with our own staff and Board. In addition I act as the liaison with other agencies, interpreting the club, its program and staff to the other workers, and their understanding and plans with a girl to our housemothers, activities leader, etc. We believe the social worker, and in

(Continued on page 14)

FRANK PENTLARGE

The Man

FRANK PENTLARGE was one of the most colorful, interesting and original human beings I ever knew. He was a Wall Street lawyer but he had no fear of a deficit merely because it was a deficit. He sat on the board of one of the largest banks of New York City but he held his membership on the League's board in far greater esteem. He knew how to balance books but he was far more concerned with balancing human values. He was a wily opponent in the court room but he applied his rare wit and precise mind to the problems of child welfare with a greater joy and satisfaction than he found in the practice of law.

Frank Pentlarge bridged the gap between the generation in which he was born and the one in which he reached mature life in a unique and amazing fashion. He brought to modern problems some of the best wisdom of the past and tempered it with the knowledge of a contemporary man of affairs. He had a genius for seeing every side of a problem at once and then going straight to the heart of it and coming up with the solution; and the solution invariably reflected the heart as well as the mind of the man.

Frank Pentlarge loved life with all his being. He loved a funny story and could tell one with relish and consummate skill. In this and other matters, his sense of timing was faultless. He had a rare perspective and breadth of view. He had zest. He had convictions. He had contempt for shoddiness, for sham, and for pretense. To some he appeared a bit austere on the surface but actually he was as warm, as responsive and as sensitive as any person I ever knew.

I shall never forget the quizzical smile that played about the corners of his mouth as he watched me trying to get out of a tough spot at a League board meeting. I shall never forget how he used to pace the floor of his office, cigar in one hand and glasses in the other, while he lectured me in the manner of a loving and patient father. I shall never forget our long talks on League affairs and our long letters. I shall never forget his devotion to his self-imposed task—the task of serving the children of America to the utmost of his capacity and strength. He saw that task as his mission and he lived it out to the full.

I have a profound sense of gratitude for all that Frank Pentlarge gave to the League and to all who came within his sphere of influence. I am grateful for the rare privilege of his friendship. We shall miss him sorely but he will be remembered wherever League members gather and his spirit will dwell with the children of America and with all who serve them.

LEONARD W. MAYO

The League's Advocate

HE helped build the Child Welfare League of America and with the building Frank Pentlarge acquired the affection and esteem of all who shared with him responsibility for the League. The staff as well as members of the Board of Directors sought his counsel without which it will tax our resources to continue the progress which he inspired.

He died in his office on November 4. It was like him to be active at the moment of his departure. It might easily have been one of the countless times he was working in behalf of the League, studying the League's financial situation or its professional publications, with which he was quite familiar, or conferring with those of the staff responsible for Executive or fund-raising duties. He averaged many hours a month in the League's service even when his health was precarious and when most men would have excused themselves from such voluntary efforts.

His national work was only part of his contribution to child welfare. He served as President of the Family and Children's Society of Montclair and had been active in various other social agencies, including the Council of Social Agencies and the Community Chest.

Repeatedly he exposed himself to the danger which finally took him from us. When warned by those closest to him he made it clear that his concern for the League was greater than his concern for himself. Typical of his courage and generosity was an evening spent with two officers of the League when he worked in a hotel room until midnight reviewing the budget which was to be presented to the Board of Directors. Only when ready to retire did he smile and admit that Mrs. Pentlarge had felt he should have avoided this work and stayed at home. He had suffered a setback in health only two days before and had refused to consult his doctor, being certain that he would have received strict orders to stay at home and rest.

It was with such devotion that for a decade Frank R. Pentlarge served the League as Treasurer, Chairman of the Finance Committee and Legal Counsel. In addition he carried other duties, being the League's representative on the governing board of American War Community Services. He participated in several regional conferences and seldom missed the annual meeting. Whether present or absent he prepared one of his inimitable Treasurer's reports.

Two excerpts from the 1948 report, submitted at Atlantic City give a glimpse of the devoted and brilliant advocate he was.

"Your treasurer has long since learned that to keep the League running he must descend from the

position of a mere professional man and become an artisan, a creator of bricks without straw; that he must realize that that nebulous item of Good-will which so often bolsters up the balance sheets of commercial enterprises must in our records have its substitute—the intangible, tangible result of League activities.”

“This organization primarily belongs to you. It is not the pet of a few wealthy persons. It has done more to raise the status of child welfare workers from mere good-intentioned souls to members of a profession than perhaps any other source. It has had the vision and it has brought to its membership and the public at large the challenge that logically follows insight and vision. It may well be that reorganized on a different basis the finances of the League would be more secure, but as a lay worker I say to you when the Child Welfare League ceases to be primarily the concern of the profession it will have lost most of its savor and effectiveness. As handicapped as the League has been by reason of financial resources, I would suggest that each one of you ask yourself the question—if the League were to cease to exist, how long would it be before those interested in child welfare as a particular phase of the entire social welfare picture would be gathering together to organize a new entity to fill the gap left by the League.”

We who knew Frank Pentlarge as an associate soon came to know him as a friend. In behalf of the children he served we will cherish his memory.

HOWARD W. HOPKIRK

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

THE Child Adoption Committee of the Free Synagogue of New York City has just introduced the policy of charging a fee of \$15 for the initial consultation for couples wishing to adopt babies. This covers as many intake interviews as may be necessary for the agency and the couple to come to a decision as to whether an application to adopt shall be made. Initiated as of November 1 the fee applies also to those who had made November appointments prior to that date. They have been informed of the new policy and left free to keep their appointments or to withdraw.

We asked the executive how significant this new policy is. Her answer was, “What it means is that instead of closing our doors to new applicants as we had been contemplating, this fee makes it possible for

us to see all those who wish an appointment on this basis and who by virtue of age, religion and geographic location would be eligible for consideration as adoption applicants.”

At a later date we hope that the evaluation of this policy will be made available to the readers of CHILD WELFARE.

READER'S FORUM

Adoption of Negro Children

Dear Editor:

I was very interested in the letter in the Reader's Forum of the October issue of CHILD WELFARE from Miss Marie C. Scott, State Case Supervisor, Kansas Children's Service League, regarding adoptive homes for Negro children.

This has certainly been a problem to us, too, and I gathered at the Child Welfare League conference on adoptions last spring that it was so for many agencies. It is difficult to understand although we have had to give a lot of thought to the remark that was made to us by a leader in the Negro community here whom we had approached for help in finding homes. He said, “Adoption is a white man's luxury. Negroes are the first to be affected by economic recession or other community tragedies—they don't dare to adopt.” On the other hand we know that there are many Negro children in need of adoption and that Negro families are adopting children.

I don't think social agencies can refuse to accept Negro children and still carry professional responsibility with integrity. And I think we are all aware of the dangers and complications in placements made outside the geographic jurisdiction of the placing agency. However, until we can find some other better solution, I wonder if we don't have to accept this as a beginning solution, providing adequate supervision through the co-operation of accredited agencies in the locality where the child is placed.

Would the solution be in some national index that agencies could use as a “clearing house”? Certainly every agency which is having difficulty in placing a child cannot individually canvass every other agency in the country which might be able to help. Some national plan would therefore seem to be the answer. The mechanics of such a plan would be cumbersome. I should think some way might be found for that.

DOROTHY E. REINHART

Supervisor, Adoption Service Bureau, Buffalo, New York

Editor's Note:

Let us put more thought on this problem.

THE ESSENTIAL FUNCTIONS OF A BOARD OF DIRECTORS*

Callman Rawley

Executive Director, Jewish Family and
Children's Service, Minneapolis, Minnesota

This provocative statement of board member functions is to serve as the basis of a symposium. Discussion which has been solicited and which is hereby further invited will appear in the January issue of CHILD WELFARE.

AT a recent National Conference three board presidents and three executives debated the question, "Is there a place for the layman in social work?" The answer, of course, had to be yes. No one would publicly say no. Why then the question? It was intended to provoke a definition, not the frequent descriptive "he is earnest, devoted, intelligent, and useful." Would we apply it to the position of the executive and try to prove that he has a place because he can be earnest, devoted, intelligent, and useful? No. A demonstration of intention and usefulness neither defines the layman's place nor proves that he has one.

The Point of View of Some Laymen

When laymen did social work, there was never any question about what they were supposed to do and no one would have asked whether there was a place in it for them. When social work, however, became a disciplined profession which boards of trustees, above others, were expected to respect as such, it created a vacuum for the layman which has not yet been filled. It introduced the question, "What is there for me to do which the trained specialist cannot do better?"

Some laymen have answered this question in a variety of unproductive ways. Some have retired because the old appeal is gone. Some have mixed feelings about the specialist and feel at times hostile to him and to the whole idea of professionalism. Their mind accepts it (at least they cannot go against the general acceptance of it), but not their heart. They are therefore often in the unhappy position of opposing professional values for reasons which they conceal from themselves and of finding that these concealed reasons constantly make their activities run over into the domain of the professional. Some who have genuinely accepted the professional nature of social work have been no more successful than those who have not in filling the void caused by the appearance of the specialist. They want the specialist to write his own ticket. In essence they say, "You are the professional. You know best. Call on us when you need us to put across what you consider necessary."

* From a paper presented at the National Conference of Jewish Social Welfare, May, 1948.

A layman who believes that he is needed only to support the specialist will eventually come to the conclusion that he is not needed at all in any organic or creative sense. Hence, the question, "Is there a place for the layman?"

Attitudes of Some Professionals

Time and again I have come across attitudes and concepts among executives which are alien and repugnant to the whole spirit of social work. For example, on the train back from a National Conference, the young man across the aisle from me was expounding to his companion with an air of great savoir faire that when an executive and his board disagree, the executive has only two choices—to give in or to be fired.

Another working principle is that the practical executive is a kind of trouble-shooter. If there is a negative ripple in a layman's mind, take care of it right away! Everything can be smoothed out if you can get to his human side and show him how human you really are. Therefore, turn on the charm, get chummy with him, call him by his first name, swap jokes with him, yes him to death, keep everyone quiet and contented.

Also, don't let anyone get on the board or on an important committee who might get out of hand. I know one executive who, to some degree unknown to himself, for years has used all kinds of backstairs influence to keep out laymen who are "too bright" or who have the time to examine issues closely or have independent self-assertive personalities. Thus did he unconsciously build around himself a mausoleum in which he could feel secure and have his own way until kingdom come.

Then there is the view that boards need to be taught, but never let them know that you are trying to do it. An executive who can teach without letting them know it, has mastered the art of administration.

So general and profound is the absence of professional method in our thinking about a board, that even good supervisors whose integrity and professional maturity in other matters are beyond question will say, as I heard one say the other day with a disturbing smile of wonder and admiration, about an

executive whom we both knew, "He doesn't know anything about casework, but as an executive he's terrific. He can make his board do anything he wants."

The common element in all these views is the Machiavellian assumption that administration is a way of manipulating boards and living by one's wits. Nothing could be more repugnant to social work. There is a desperate need to toss these pernicious ideas on the junk heap where they belong with our old discarded ideas about manipulating clients. But first there must be a grasp and a conviction of indigenous lay function.

The late Kenneth Pray was one of the few men who talked and acted as if he knew from experience that a board of directors have an organic and creative function, quite apart from their use as volunteers and supporters of social work, and that it is primarily in relation to this function that administration as a professional process, as distinguished from administration as an imported managerial process, exists. This function in its innate elemental form, stripped of sociological clichés, can be seen in an agency's beginnings.

Responsibilities of Board of Trustees

Agencies begin in the troubled social consciences of a few men who have become aware of people suffering, and feel an imperative need to do something about it. Out of this is born a purpose and a goal. In the ingenuous words ascribed to Alexis DeTocqueville, who observed this process in its simple beginnings 100 years ago:

"These Americans are a peculiar people. When some citizen in a community decides that something is needed, he thereupon communicates this sense of need to his neighbors. Promptly a committee is brought into existence. And in a very short time this committee has begun to meet the need."

That is, it has raised the money and set up an agency and become the board. Its conviction that it shares a common social conscience both with those who have a name and an address and are willing to support the service, and with all those nameless, numberless individuals who believe that people in distress should be helped, makes it ethically permissible for them in a democracy to take the grass roots initiative for setting up and directing the new service and to act thereby as surrogate for the conscience of others.

The next step, if they follow their conscience and practical necessity, is to protect the service they have set up. This protection of service to the client is one board responsibility which is organic to the very ethical motivation behind the service and to its

practical needs for survival. A second board responsibility equally organic because it is the means for discharging the first, is the maintenance of a responsible relationship to both the community and the clientele.

Are there others so organic to this ethical motivation as to be above the authority of both the board itself to renounce or change, and the executive to dole out as he pleases or as his professional judgment may decide? I believe there are and that it is possible to discover them in the common ground of social ethics among men from which social service emanates. On this common ground which may be said to express the unspoken wishes of a community with regard to board responsibilities, all men, it seems to me, would agree that:

An agency should be operated efficiently and honestly

All those who need and are eligible for its services should be able to get them

The services should be maintained as long as they are needed

The public should be kept informed about operations

People with the high social conscience of board members would also be expected to keep the public informed about unmet social needs which it has run across in the course of its operations. This is implicit in good citizenship. If the public and the client could make their wishes known, they would find that they had a common interest in preserving these responsibilities because they protect service and are the practical imperatives flowing out of the ethical motivation common to both board and community, and are hence a board's channel for acting as surrogate for the conscience of others.

Public and client have other interests in common toward the only implementer of service—staff:

Highly skilled practitioners

Professional leadership under which practitioners can improve their knowledge and skill

Working conditions which maintain stability

A high quality of professional interest, internal harmony and co-ordination which enable every member of the staff to apply his knowledge and skill effectively and maintain dignity and self-respect as a professional practitioner are prerequisites. The fact that clients have a more immediate stake in these responsibilities does not make them any the less an inseparable and logical part of the measures which the board takes to fulfill its central function of protecting the agency's services.

These responsibilities are inherent in the matrix of social conscience and community roots and relations from which they issue. As such, they were not created by either the executive or the board and are not the creature of either. Their adamant reality, to which

both must adapt themselves, towers outside both. From the individual conscience and the desire to maintain and protect needed services wells up their motive power—the psychological drive from the one and the specific responsibilities and concrete measures which will protect the services, from the other.

Summary and Conclusions

These responsibilities fall into four categories. Seeing that the agency is run honestly and efficiently, and that all who need its services and are eligible for them are able to get them, is a *control* function. Keeping the community informed is a *channeling* function. Maintaining a needed service and helping to develop community resources for unmet social needs are a *social action* function. Maintaining proper working conditions and professional leadership, and taking measures to improve efficiency are an *enabling* function.

This 4-step sequence constitutes a base from which a board can begin to evaluate itself. If, for example, it wishes to evaluate whether it is expressing in its day-by-day deliberations some semblance of the collective judgment and wishes of this hypothetical community, it must ask:

1. Whether it is acting in such a way as to continue to carry out the purpose which originally had community support;
2. Whether it continues to be accepted as surrogate for the conscience of the community;
3. How it involves others in the community who have the conscience and the willingness to act in behalf of the need which the agency is intended to serve;
4. How it proceeds to represent the conscience and the wishes of the community in its planning for agency program;
5. How it sustains channels of information to the community so that the agency purpose continues to be clear to others, and so that the community can judge it by its own conscience and social concern;
6. How it changes program or purpose from time to time.

It must also ask whether its members have the original qualities of the founders of the agency:

1. A highly developed social conscience.
2. Sensitivity to the particular social needs which the agency tries to serve (this need must disturb them and have a special appeal for them).
3. A willingness to carry their concern and sensitivity into action.
4. A willingness and an ability, both as individuals and as a whole board, to apply to questions which come up judgment which is within a reasonable range of what would be community opinion.

These, as I see it, make up the four essential board functions, the inescapable functions. They are the essential reality which marks out the tasks of board and executive in relation to each other.

RESIDENCE CLUBS FOR ADOLESCENT GIRLS

(Continued from page 9)

general, the activities leader, should not be used in a disciplinary role. When a matter of discipline is involved with which the housemother needs help, I participate; first, in supporting her, and then if necessary entering the picture as the final authority. Our program is worked out closely with Board committees and we have their support and co-operation.

Summary

This type of program offers many values for the emotionally disturbed adolescent girl, such as intensive casework treatment, objective but not impersonal care, association with others of her age group, a variety of persons from whom she can select friends, normal participation in community activities, planned group activities, the possibility of maintaining contact and working through her relationships with her family, and the conscious building on group strengths—plus the flexibility of allowing for individualization. The successful operation of the program depends on an interested and supporting Board, a trained and interested staff, and careful selection of girls who need and can use our type of service.

REGIONAL CONFERENCES

The Southern Regional Conference will be held February 10, 11 and 12, 1949, at the Jefferson Davis Hotel, Montgomery, Alabama. The Chairman is Mrs. Edward Gresham, Director, Bureau of Child Welfare, Alabama Department of Public Welfare.

The Ohio Valley Regional Conference will be held March 17, 18 and 19, 1949, at the Netherland Plaza Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio. The Chairman is Mr. Duane W. Christy, Executive Vice-President of The Children's Home of Cincinnati.

The Eastern Regional Conference will be held April 7, 8 and 9, 1949, at the Ambassador Hotel, Atlantic City, New Jersey. The Chairman is Mr. Walter P. Townsend, General Secretary, Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania.

The Midwest Regional Conference will be held May 1 to 4, 1949, at the Hotel LaSalle, Chicago, Illinois. The Chairman is Mrs. Mary Lawrence, Executive Director, Jewish Children's Bureau of Chicago.

The New England Regional Conference will be held June 6 and 7, 1949, at the Wentworth-by-the-Sea, Portsmouth, New Hampshire. The Chairman is Mrs. Jeanette H. Melton, General Secretary, New Hampshire Children's Aid Society.

THE BOARD MEMBER SPEAKS ON

The Charity Ball Passes

WE asked a prominent and busy layman, Mrs. Margaret Culkin Banning, to say a few words on Community Chest Activities and Service on behalf of children. She has been particularly close to the situation in Duluth, Minnesota, and so she wrote with that experience in mind.

"Thirty years ago, in my own city, we had three homes for orphaned children. One was an orphanage supported by the Catholic diocese, one was an institution under Lutheran control, and one was a Children's Home, begun as a private charity by a group of wealthy men and women and carried on traditionally by their children and friends. The source of income for the church institutions came from various parish collections and that of the private Children's Home from individual donations, swelled by the 'take' of the most fashionable dance of the year, always known as the Charity Ball.

"There was considerable dubiousness in the minds of various people when, twenty-seven years ago, the Catholic and Lutheran orphanages turned their financial fortunes over for the most part to the local Community Chest. Favoritism and competition between the institutions were prophesied, as well as financial instability, if rich contributors were not held by loyalty, sentimentality, or pleasant gratefulness to the support of one orphanage. But now, looking back over a quarter of a century, which is long enough to be sure of a result, the doubters have been proved wrong. They found that it is of advantage to the children who are their concern when the community, as a whole, underwrites the services for children."

From personal contact she tells what it means when *Everybody Gives*. "I know a practical nurse, deserted by her husband and with a large family to support, who put her small children in the Catholic home for safety. She pays what she can for their support conscientiously. She never thinks of them as being dependent on charity. There is no reason why she should! She used to contribute to the Community Fund and will again. I know a teacher whose husband developed tuberculosis, and must be in a sanitarium for years, who also had to find a refuge for her children for the time being. She too paid pledges to the Community Fund in the past."

The change in the method of raising funds was

accompanied by changes in care for the children reports Mrs. Banning:

"There was renewed scrutiny of the care of children who had no homes of their own for good or unfortunate reasons. Everything had to be discussed, before the long-existent and beloved charity would merge its finances with the Community Fund, and before the Fund would accept another agency for which money would have to be raised every year. And it was done with general satisfaction on both sides. Now all the children in our city whose parents or relatives are unable or unwilling to care for them are the charges of the community. Their maintenance comes from the generosity of a developed social conscience in the city."

And Mrs. Banning tells how far-reaching is that "developed social conscience":

"In my town, the community has not only taken the care of the children over financially. Most citizens accept the social responsibility for children who are not their own. A person who refuses to give becomes a little queer. The organizer of one district said to me of a certain well-to-do woman who did not subscribe to the Fund, 'What's wrong with her?' She said it as if she had heard of a defect or illness, as if it must be curable. I hope so."

She then concludes with:

"In this dreading and nervous decade, one of the most comforting thoughts in which we can take refuge is that most children in America are getting a reasonably good start in life. Certainly this is true of those children whose health and welfare are the responsibility of the community, if the city or town lives up to the modern social standards of America. But there is never enough money in our Community Fund, nor in most funds that I know of, to do all that could be done for growing children. Parents are never content with giving their children a minimum of food and shelter. They want to provide the best environment possible and that is hard to do, as costs go up. It is just as hard for the community, that excellent modern foster parent. The Community Funds of America are among the greatest of our public utilities. Most people are willing to pay for what they get sensibly and generously. No subscription is more truly bread upon the water of civilization."

PLANNING FOR CHILD WELFARE

Members of Boards of Trustees all over the land have been asking what a community needs to bear in mind when planning its child welfare program. In her article, "The American Scene as a Background for a 1950 Conference on Children,"* Katharine Lenroot reports challengingly on the factors in a community's day-to-day life that affect the growth and development of children.

The validity of much of what she has to say is rooted in the fact that the development of a service of personal security is possible only as children have the "love of mature parents" and to children "love" means that the parents can provide a loving, protecting home, their daily needs, and make available the resources and experiences for the development of the child's native capacities.

Having agreed that children need their own parents desperately, parents need to be able to earn enough to care for their children. What is the American scene?

"In 1945 the average (median) income of families having four or more children under 18 years of age was about \$2,100 as compared with \$2,800 for those with one or two children. About one third of urban families with children under the age of 18 years had annual incomes of less than \$2,500, but more than two fifths of urban families with four or more children under 18 years of age had incomes under this amount."

Furthermore:

"At least 13 per cent of our children and young people under 20 years of age are subject to discrimination because of race. What does this mean to a child's development? In 1945, the average annual income of nonwhite families was only about half that of white families (\$1,538 as compared with \$2,718). Nonwhite families are likely to pay more for far less adequate housing."

Parents should be able to supply their children with an adequate home, yet:

"In 1947, 2,800,000 families were living doubled up with other families. An additional 500,000 families were living in temporary housing, trailers, rooming houses, and other makeshift accommodations."

The tie between the child and mother is a *must* for the success of:

"The biggest business in the world and the most important business in the world, the business which outweighs all other values in the world, . . . the business of rearing children."†

* *The Child*, June, 1948.

† Dr. Brock Chisholm, Executive Secretary, Interim Commission of the World Health Organization.

Yet, to quote Miss Lenroot again:

"In 1946, almost 2,000,000 women with children under 10 years of age were in the labor force. In the same year, 910,000 women in the labor force were the heads of families with one or more children under 18 years of age."

Before local services can be said to be truly effective these inequalities need to be corrected.

Some point to our social security system, of which we are duly proud. Yet concern about the welfare of children demands that we face realistically the implications for children in the fact that:

"We have a social security system, but millions of families are excluded from it. The security it provides is meager indeed."

However, as is to be expected, there are some families which cannot provide for their children. Of these some can still give their children care if the wherewithal is provided. Others need to be relieved of the care of their children for a period with help to so deal with the problem that makes the separation necessary that either they can re-establish a home or can release their children, particularly young ones, for permanent placement.

What have we been doing with regard to aid to dependent children? At present the federal maximums are \$27.00 per month for the first child and \$18.00 for each additional child. That includes allowance for the fact that the mother too must live, if she is to care for the children.

And then a community needs a foster care program for those children who must be removed from their homes. This should be provided by both public and private agencies. As Margaret A. Emery, Field Consultant on Foster Care, United States Children's Bureau,* points out, many communities do provide the

"... wide variety of facilities—foster-family homes, institutions, and day-care centers. They include casework services to individual children; they include also services to children in groups. They include the help that the social worker or the executive gives toward improving the community's program or the community's understanding of children, individually and collectively."

We must look with Miss Emery too at the "Gaps in Service."

"The unmet needs are legion. Some stand out: Need for services to children in their own homes; need for foster-care services and facilities of all kinds for mentally retarded children, children with emotional and behavior problems, Negro and other children in minority groups, and chronically ill or convalescent children; need for services and facilities for unmarried mothers; need for facilities for emergency and detention care; and need for specialized institutional facilities."

Both these articles need to be read in full.

* "For Children Who Need Foster Care," *The Child*, June, 1948.

H. L. G.

A CITY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH SETS UP A DAY CARE UNIT*

DAY CARE is currently a young and fertile field for co-ordination and co-operation. It is relatively new and therefore still in flux and not too channeled. Like the young child, it too is eager in motion, and fresh. It has grown up simultaneously with other professions. They have necessarily impinged constantly on one another to their mutual advantage, and the enrichment of each. To understand a child as an individual, as a member of his family, as a member of his group and of his community requires a skilled and sensitive eye and mind, and a somewhat varied approach.

Most education of the past has been for a static kind of living, based on fixed, approved standards and the acquisition of definite, specific, learned knowledge and factual information. Today education must prepare children from their earliest years for a rapidly changing world. Children must learn to be selective, to evaluate and discriminate, to live in dynamic terms, to think on their feet, to remedy their own mistakes, to judge wisely, to be both flexible and strong.

This approach must color our thinking and planning for the future of day care. We must have the courage to dig deep, and work now, for children.

Much is stirring in the day care field throughout the nation. Five years ago a new unit was set up in the Bureau of Child Hygiene in the New York City Department of Health called the Day Care Unit.† For the first time in the history of the city a full-time well-qualified professional staff was selected to give thought and concentrated effort toward surveying, evaluating and improving the standards of day care in New York City. This staff consisted of public health nurses and a public health nursing supervisor, nursery education consultants and a nursery education supervisor, as well as a social work supervisor and consultant. The purpose behind having this staff was to make available to the day care agencies of New York City the resources of these three professional fields. To work effectively the staff necessarily has had to mesh its own thinking constantly.

A new licensing code and a new procedure were established requiring every day care agency to be relicensed every two years. Licensing is based on

whether or not an agency meets the minimum requirements of the new Sanitary Code which was adopted by the Board of Health in February, 1943. This code is a remarkable document. It interprets health as including the physical, mental and emotional health of the children. The premises in which groups of young children live must be approved by the Fire Department, the Bureau of Sanitary Engineering of the Health Department and the Housing and Buildings Department as a part of the regular licensing procedure. In addition the staff must meet State Education Department qualifications in the field of early childhood education. There must be adequate space and equipment, a satisfactory program indoors and out and even "comfort for the children during meals." The program, in action, is carefully observed by members of the Day Care Unit staff, and both medical and registration records are reviewed. Every member of the staff must have a medical examination and a chest x-ray and every child must have a complete medical examination before admission and every six months thereafter.

There are at present approximately 400 day care agencies in Greater New York caring for some 20,000 children under six years of age, in addition to those in the public and parochial schools.*

Through this program New York City has shown foresight and courage in tackling a complex and difficult situation. The job is as yet far from complete, as it is as much a matter of public education as it is of standard-raising. With the congestion of New York City, it is indeed difficult to find adequate space for the young children to live and move and have their being.

The 72 (of the total 400 Day Care Agencies) which were operated as Child Care Centers during the war are now being continued and sustained by city funds in order that some 4,500 young children of working mothers may find a satisfactory haven for the good living of their children while they are at work.

For the future: Throughout the country numerous other groups are also at the beginning of their new road for children. The goal for us all is better human living, right from the beginning of life, and better human understanding. It is not yet a smooth, broad highway. The time for talking is over—the time for working is here. Let's raise our sights for our human young and do the job together.

CORNELIA GOLDSMITH

*Director, Day Care Unit, Bureau of Child Hygiene
City of New York, Department of Health*

* From a paper delivered at the National Conference of Social Work, April, 1948.

† See "The Day Care of Little Children in a Big City, A Report of the Work of the Department of Health, New York City, May, 1946, Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

* The Department of Health plans to issue a directory of licensed Day Care Agencies in New York City this spring.

TO MAKE WILLS MOST EFFECTIVE*

This how-to-do-it article on making wills is presented with an invitation for further statements.

ISN'T it strange how some people tie up their wills in iron chains so that the purposes for which they had hoped their money would be used, cannot be used?

Isn't it strange, too, how some people put clauses in their wills, which in the course of time make it impossible to carry out a person's will because the purposes for which those clauses were inserted have long since ceased to exist?

Take the case of *Quimby vs. Quimby*, for example. Without any prior consultation with the organization she sought to help, a woman bequeathed the remainder of her estate to the Chicago Waifs Mission and Training School, which was organized to provide suitable homes for dependent and needy boys and girls. The will provided that this remainder should be paid five years after the death of the testatrix, providing a "contingency had not occurred." The five years passed and the contingency had not occurred. But by this time the Chicago Waifs Mission and Training School had ceased to exist.

Or take the case of the man who left a large sum of money for a certain established home for crippled children, "providing that home remained in the locality in which it had been built." Unfortunately the neighborhood deteriorated terribly and the home had to be moved to a more desirable section of the city—a fact which occurred only three months prior to the death of the testator. There doesn't seem to have been any evidence that the testator had even consulted this home to determine its plan for the future.

Or there is the case of Fred Long of Naperville, who desired that the remainder of his estate be used by that city to establish, construct and maintain a hospital. Mr. Long had merely pulled this idea out of the blue—seeking a way to help his community—without any word to or consultation with anyone who may have had some knowledge of the difficulties involved. Though the funds were paid over to the city, and though the city had passed a resolution accepting the funds under the condition of the will, 13 years went by and nothing had been done toward that project. During this time neither the city nor the hospital fund had a sufficient sum of money to establish and construct a hospital.

* From an interview with Sidney L. Robin, Chairman, Committee on Bequests, The Jewish Charities of Chicago. Reported in *JC Review*, April, 1948.

Though it was apparent that the testator had in mind the needs of the community in which he had lived so long, the U. S. District Court ruled that the monies in the hospital fund be paid to a rather large group of distant relatives, "since the resolution of acceptance by the city of Naperville was but an empty gesture."

. . . .

But because of the shifting needs of a community, and the ever-changing conditions, the best kind of bequest to a charitable organization is an unrestricted gift, for then the money can be used where it is most needed. Such gifts may be made payable in a single year, or spread out equally or in declining amounts over a number of years. Depending upon the needs of the community, an unrestricted gift may be used at once or conserved and wisely invested against the time when the funds will be used to best advantage.

. . . .

Five Cardinal Principles to Observe in Making Charitable Bequests

1. Unrestricted bequests to charitable and philanthropic organizations are most desirable. Such funds are thereby quickly available to meet new needs and changing conditions on a broad humanitarian front.
2. Determine if the organization which is to become a beneficiary under your will is well established and doing necessary and creditable work.
3. Establish broad provisions for the use of the funds, rather than confining the terms of the bequest to narrow limits.
4. Where it is your desire to establish a specific project, make certain that that project is definitely needed. And determine whether that project may already be adequately covered by some other bequest.
5. Be sure to consult the proposed beneficiary organization whenever specific projects are to be set up. Good charitable and philanthropic organizations . . . are thoroughly familiar with social welfare needs and planning; they are in position to give sound advice on many proposed projects dealing with human welfare.

PAMPHLET NOTES

SOME SPECIAL PROBLEMS OF CHILDREN AGED 2 TO 5 YEARS, by Nina Ridenour, in collaboration with Isabel Johnson. Eight Leaflets. New York City Committee on Mental Hygiene, 1947. 75 cents. Separate leaflets 10 cents each.

This is a group of leaflets entitled

WHEN A CHILD HURTS OTHER CHILDREN

WHEN A CHILD IS DESTRUCTIVE

WHEN A CHILD USES BAD LANGUAGE

WHEN A CHILD WON'T SHARE

WHEN A CHILD STILL SUCKS HIS THUMB

WHEN A CHILD STILL WEETS

WHEN A CHILD MASTURBATES

WHEN A CHILD HAS FEARS

They are designed for parents and for those who counsel with parents, social workers, child study group leaders and physicians who lecture to parent groups.

A FEW LIVES: A Report of Dosoris Study and Treatment Home for Adolescent Girls 1945-1947. Community Service Society of New York. 1948. 87 pp.

This is the story of an experiment in group living for adolescent girls by the Family Service of the Community Service Society of New York City. As stated in the introduction, this "demonstrates a new 'method of analysis' of the dynamics of adolescent behavior through the study and treatment of disturbed adolescent girls in a temporary living situation." The introduction goes on to say, "We feel that this method not only provides more effectively for the hitherto unmet needs of a specific client body but also has increased greatly our knowledge regarding this age group in general."

This pamphlet is available on loan to League member agencies.

RECENT ADDITIONS TO LEAGUE'S LIBRARY

Reviewed in the past year and available on loan to League member agencies.

Books

ADOPTING A CHILD, by Frances Lockridge. Greenberg, N. Y. 1947. 216 pp. \$3.00.

ADOPTION IN NEW YORK CITY. An inquiry into Adoptions and Related Services made by the New York City Committee on Adoptions. Welfare Council of New York City. 1948. \$1.25.

THE CHILD AND HIS WELFARE, by Hazel Fredericksen. W. H. Freeman & Co., San Francisco. 1948. 328 pp. \$3.75.

CHILDREN OF THE CUMBERLAND, by Claudia Lewis. Columbia University Press, N. Y. 1946. 217 pp. \$2.75.

GROUP EXPERIENCE AND DEMOCRATIC VALUES, by Grace Coyle. The Woman's Press, N. Y. 1948. 180 pp. \$2.75.

GROUP PROCESS IN ADMINISTRATION, by Harleigh B. Trecker. The Woman's Press, N. Y. 1946. 127 pp. \$2.75.

HOW TO INTERPRET SOCIAL WELFARE, by Helen Cody Baker and Mary Swain Routzahn. Russell Sage Foundation, N. Y. 1947. 141 pp. \$2.50.

THE PERSONALITY OF THE PRESCHOOL CHILD: THE CHILD'S SEARCH FOR HIS SELF, by Werner Wolff. Greene & Stratton, N. Y. 1946. 341 pp. Vol. I.

PSYCHIATRY FOR THE PEDIATRICIAN, by Hale F. Shirley, M.D. The Commonwealth Fund, N. Y. 1948.

RUSSELL SAGE FOUNDATION 1907-1946: A HISTORY, by John M. Glenn, et al. Russell Sage Foundation, N. Y. 1947. 746 pp. \$5.00.

SEXUAL BEHAVIOR IN THE HUMAN MALE, by Alfred C. Kinsey, et al. W. B. Saunders, Philadelphia. 1948. 804 pp. \$6.50.

STUDIES OF CHILDREN. Edited by Gladys E. Meyer. King's Crown Press, N. Y. 1948. 184 pp. \$2.50.

UNTIL THE LEAST OF THESE, by Emma O. Lundberg. D. Appleton-Century Co., Inc. 1947. 424 pp. \$3.75.

YOUTH IN DESPAIR, by Ralph S. Banay. Coward-McCann, Inc. N. Y. 1948. \$3.50.

Pamphlets

COUNSELING AND PROTECTIVE SERVICE AS FAMILY CASE WORK: A FUNCTIONAL APPROACH. Edited by Jessie Taft. Pennsylvania School of Social Work. 1946. \$1.50.

DEVELOPING INSIGHT IN INITIAL INTERVIEWS, by Alice L. Voiland, et al. Family Service Association of America, N. Y. 1947. 60 cents.

SOME DYNAMICS OF SOCIAL AGENCY ADMINISTRATION. Family Service Association of America, N. Y. 76 pp. 75 cents.

UNMARRIED PARENTHOOD: A STUDY OF 1839 UNMARRIED PARENTHOOD CASES, Helen C. Dean. Welfare Council of Metropolitan Los Angeles. Publication No. 3. 1946.



INFORMATION

A Necessary Resource

During the twenty-eight years of its existence THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC., has assembled a reservoir of information on social services for children which it makes available to child caring organizations around the world.

Almost the full time of three staff members is required to handle the daily inquiries, personal and by correspondence, of students, professional workers and lay leaders, compile the data requested, and speed it on its way. The type of material constantly asked for covers such phases as:

ADMINISTRATION *Policies and procedures*

ADOPTION *Problems and practices*

CASEWORK *Principles and methods*

DAY CARE *Organization and services*

FOSTER HOME CARE *Philosophy and process*

HOMEFINDING *Recruiting and home study*

SERVICES TO UNMARRIED MOTHERS *For self and child*

PERSONNEL PRACTICES *Staff and board responsibility*

PUBLIC RELATIONS *Goal and method*

These services are brought to the child welfare field as a direct result of the co-operation of League member agencies and provisionals.

THE CHILD WELFARE LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

130 EAST 22ND STREET, NEW YORK 10, N. Y.

—★

—★

C.

C